

## EXHIBIT 295 – A

1                   IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2                   FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
3                   EASTERN DIVISION

4                   - - -

5  
6           IN RE:   NATIONAL                                 :     MDL NO. 2804  
7           PRESCRIPTION OPIATE                         :  
8           LITIGATION                                     :  
9   :

-----  
10          THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO                   :    CASE NO.  
11          ALL CASES                                    :    1:17-MD-2804  
12   :  
13   :    Hon. Dan A.  
14   :    Polster

15                   - - -

16                   February 8, 2019

17                   - - -

18                   HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO FURTHER  
19                   CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW

20                   Continued videotaped deposition  
21                   of STEPHEN MAYS taken pursuant to notice, was  
22                   held at the law offices of Reed Smith LLP, Three  
23                   Logan Square, 1717 Arch Street, Suite 3100,  
24                   Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, beginning at 11:12  
a.m., on the above date, before Ann Marie  
Mitchell, a Federally Approved Certified Realtime  
Reporter, Registered Diplomate Reporter,  
Registered Merit Reporter and Notary Public.

25                   - - -

26                   GOLKOW LITIGATION SERVICES  
27                   877.370.3377 ph | 917.591.5672 fax  
28                   deps@golkow.com

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES:</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 BARON &amp; BUDD, P.C.</p> <p>4 BY: MARK PIFKO, ESQUIRE</p> <p>5 15910 Ventura Boulevard</p> <p>6 Suite 1600</p> <p>7 Encino, California 91436</p> <p>8 (818) 839-2333</p> <p>9 mpifko@baronbudd.com</p> <p>10 Representing the Plaintiffs</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 BARON &amp; BUDD, P.C.</p> <p>13 BY: WILLIAM POWERS, ESQUIRE</p> <p>14 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW</p> <p>15 The Watergate, Suite 10-A</p> <p>16 Washington, DC 20037</p> <p>17 (202) 333-4562</p> <p>18 wpowers@baronbudd.com</p> <p>19 Representing the Plaintiffs</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 REED SMITH LLP</p> <p>22 BY: SHANNON E. McCLURE, ESQUIRE</p> <p>23 BY: JEFFREY R. MELTON, ESQUIRE</p> <p>24 BY: ABIGAIL M. PIERCE, ESQUIRE</p> <p>Three Logan Square</p> <p>1717 Arch Street, Suite 3100</p> <p>Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103</p> <p>(215) 851-8100</p> <p>smcclure@reedsmith.com</p> <p>jmelson@reedsmith.com</p> <p>abigail.pierce@reedsmith.com</p> <p>Representing AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES VIA TELEPHONE/STREAM:</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 BARON &amp; BUDD, P.C.</p> <p>4 BY: W. SCOTT SIMMER, ESQUIRE</p> <p>5 BY: GRETCHEN KEARNEY, ESQUIRE</p> <p>6 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW</p> <p>7 The Watergate, Suite 10-A</p> <p>8 Washington, DC 20037</p> <p>9 (202) 333-4562</p> <p>10 ssimmer@baronbudd.com</p> <p>11 gkearney@baronbudd.com</p> <p>12 Representing Plaintiffs</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 BARON &amp; BUDD, P.C.</p> <p>15 BY: STERLING CLUFF, ESQUIRE</p> <p>16 BY: JAY LICHTER, ESQUIRE</p> <p>17 15910 Ventura Blvd</p> <p>18 Suite 1600</p> <p>19 Encino, California 91436</p> <p>20 (818) 839-2333</p> <p>21 cluff@baronbudd.com</p> <p>22 jlichter@baronbudd.com</p> <p>23 Representing the Plaintiffs</p> <p>24</p> <p>GREENE KETCHUM FARRELL BAILEY &amp; TWEEL LLP</p> <p>BY: PAUL THOMAS FARRELL JR., ESQUIRE</p> <p>419 Eleventh Street</p> <p>Huntington, West Virginia 25701</p> <p>(304) 525-9115</p> <p>Representing the Plaintiffs</p> <p>THE LANIER LAW FIRM</p> <p>BY: EVAN M. JANUSH, ESQUIRE</p> <p>Tower 56</p> <p>126 East 56th Street, 6th Floor</p> <p>New York, New York 10022</p> <p>(212) 421-2800</p> <p>evan.janush@lanierlawfirm.com</p> <p>Representing the Plaintiffs</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (cont.'d):</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 JONES DAY</p> <p>4 BY: ADAM HOLLINGSWORTH, ESQUIRE</p> <p>5 North Point</p> <p>6 901 Lakeside Avenue</p> <p>7 Cleveland, Ohio 44114</p> <p>8 (216) 586-3939</p> <p>9 ahollingsworth@jonesday.com</p> <p>10 Representing Walmart</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 COVINGTON &amp; BURLING, LLP</p> <p>13 BY: MEGHAN E. MONAGHAN, ESQUIRE</p> <p>14 One City Center, 850 Tenth Street, NW</p> <p>15 Washington, DC 20001</p> <p>16 (202) 662-5272</p> <p>17 mmonaghan@cov.com</p> <p>18 Representing McKesson Corporation</p> <p>19</p> <p>20 WILLIAMS &amp; CONNOLLY LLP</p> <p>21 BY: KATELYN ADAMS, ESQUIRE</p> <p>22 725 Twelfth Street, N.W.</p> <p>23 Washington, DC 20005</p> <p>24 kadams@wc.com</p> <p>(202) 434-5000</p> <p>Representing Cardinal Health</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES VIA TELEPHONE/STREAM (cont.'d):</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 BLASINGAME, BURCH, GARRARD &amp; ASHLEY, P.C.</p> <p>4 BY: ALEXANDRA K. HUGHES, ESQUIRE</p> <p>5 440 College Avenue</p> <p>6 Suite 320</p> <p>7 Athens, Georgia 30601</p> <p>8 (706) 744-4135</p> <p>9 ahughes@bbga.com</p> <p>10 Representing the Plaintiffs</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 BAILEY &amp; WYANT, PLLC</p> <p>13 BY: HARRISON M. CYRUS, ESQUIRE</p> <p>14 500 Virginia Street East</p> <p>15 Suite 600</p> <p>16 Charleston, West Virginia 25301</p> <p>17 (304) 345-4222</p> <p>18 hcyrus@baileywyant.com</p> <p>19 Representing the West Virginia Board of Pharmacy</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 REED SMITH LLP</p> <p>22 BY: ANNE E. ROLLINS, ESQUIRE</p> <p>23 Three Logan Square</p> <p>24 1717 Arch Street, Suite 3100</p> <p>Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103</p> <p>(215) 851-8100</p> <p>arollins@reedsmith.com</p> <p>Representing AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation</p> <p>ROPES &amp; GRAY LLP</p> <p>BY: LUKE D. RILEY, ESQUIRE</p> <p>Prudential Tower</p> <p>800 Boylston Street</p> <p>Boston, Massachusetts 02199</p> <p>(617) 951-7000</p> <p>luke.riley@ropesgray.com</p> <p>Representing Mallinckrodt</p>

Page 6	Page 8
<p>1 APPEARANCES VIA TELEPHONE/STREAM (cont.'d):</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 ARNOLD &amp; PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP</p> <p>4 BY: ZENO HOUSTON, ESQUIRE</p> <p>5 250 West 55th Street</p> <p>6 New York, New York 10019</p> <p>7 (212) 836-8000</p> <p>8 zeno.houston@arnoldporter.com</p> <p>9 Representing Endo Health Solutions; Endo</p> <p>10 Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Par Pharmaceutical</p> <p>11 Companies, Inc. f/k/a Par Pharmaceutical</p> <p>12 Holdings, Inc.</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 BARNES &amp; THORNBURG LLP</p> <p>15 BY: MONIQUE HANNAM, ESQUIRE</p> <p>16 11 South Meridian Street</p> <p>17 Indianapolis, Indiana 46204</p> <p>18 (317) 236-1313</p> <p>19 monique.hannam@btlaw.com</p> <p>20 Representing HD Smith</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 VIDEOGRAPHER:</p> <p>23 DAVID LANE</p> <p>24</p> <p>TRIAL TECHNICIAN:</p> <p>ZACH HONE</p> <p>ALSO PRESENT:</p> <p>CHRISTOPHER CASALENUOVO, ESQUIRE</p> <p>AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation</p> <p>ALSO PRESENT VIA TELEPHONE/STREAM:</p> <p>TIFFANY ELLIS</p> <p>Weitz &amp; Luxenberg P.C.</p>	<p>1 - - -</p> <p>2 I N D E X</p> <p>3 - - -</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 Testimony of: STEPHEN MAYS</p> <p>6 By Mr. Pifko 12</p> <p>7</p> <p>8 - - -</p> <p>9 E X H I B I T S</p> <p>10 - - -</p> <p>11 NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE</p> <p>12 Mays V2-1 Order to Show Cause and 17</p> <p>13 Immediate Suspension of</p> <p>14 Registration, Bates</p> <p>15 stamped ABDCMDL00269383</p> <p>16 through ABDCMDL00269387</p> <p>17 Mays V2-2 Email chain, top one dated 91</p> <p>18 3 Mar 2013, Bates stamped</p> <p>19 ABDCMDL00378483 through</p> <p>20 ABDCMDL00378488</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 Mays V2-3 Email chain, top one dated 99</p> <p>23 2/6/2008, Bates stamped</p> <p>24 CAH_MDL2804_01364805</p> <p>through</p> <p>CAH_MDL2804_01364809</p>
Page 7	Page 9
<p>1</p> <p>2 JOSH GAY</p> <p>3 Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell</p> <p>4 Rafferty Proctor P.A.</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 EMMA KABOLI</p> <p>7 Baron &amp; Budd, P.C.</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 ALEX SHERMAN</p> <p>10 - - -</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p>	<p>1 - - -</p> <p>2 DEPOSITION SUPPORT INDEX</p> <p>3 - - -</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 Direction to Witness Not to Answer</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 Page Line</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 Request for Production of Documents</p> <p>10 Page Line</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 Stipulations</p> <p>15</p> <p>16 Page Line</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19 Question Marked</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 Page Line</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p>

Page 10

1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're now on  
 2 the record. My name is David Lane,  
 3 videographer for Golkow Litigation  
 4 Services. Today's date is 11:12 a.m.  
 5 This deposition is taking place in  
 6 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania in the matter  
 7 of National Prescription Opiate  
 8 Litigation MDL.  
 9 Our deponent today is Steve Mays.  
 10 All counsel will be noted on the  
 11 stenographic record.  
 12 The court reporter is Ann Marie  
 13 Mitchell, who will now swear in our  
 14 witness.  
 15 - - -  
 16 STEPHEN MAYS, after having been  
 17 duly sworn, was examined and testified as  
 18 follows:  
 19 - - -  
 20 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Please begin.  
 21 MR. PIFKO: Could we get everyone  
 22 to state their appearance, or did people  
 23 already do that?  
 24 Mark Pifko from Baron & Budd on

Page 11

1 behalf of the plaintiffs and the PEC.  
 2 MR. POWERS: Will Powers, also  
 3 from Baron & Budd.  
 4 MS. McCLURE: Shannon McClure on  
 5 behalf of ABDC.  
 6 MR. MELTON: Jeffrey Melton on  
 7 behalf of ABDC.  
 8 MR. CASALENUOVO: Chris  
 9 Casalenuovo with ABDC.  
 10 MS. PIERCE: Abigail Pierce,  
 11 Reed.  
 12 MS. MONAGHAN: Meghan Monaghan  
 13 for McKesson.  
 14 MS. ADAMS: Kate Adams for  
 15 Cardinal Health.  
 16 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Adam  
 17 Hollingsworth on behalf of Walmart.  
 18 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Counsel on the  
 19 phone?  
 20 MS. HANNAM: This is Monique  
 21 Hannam on behalf of HD Smith.  
 22 MR. RILEY: Luke Riley on behalf  
 23 of Ropes & Gray.  
 24 MR. HOUSTON: Zeno Houston from

Page 12

1 Arnold & Porter on behalf of Endo and  
 2 Par.  
 3 MR. FARRELL: Paul Farrell on  
 4 behalf of the PEC.  
 5 COURT REPORTER: Counsel?  
 6 MS. McCLURE: Paul? Hey, Paul,  
 7 you're going to have to restate that. I  
 8 could hear your name vaguely, but the  
 9 court reporter and the videographer could  
 10 not hear you.  
 11 MR. FARRELL: This is Paul  
 12 Farrell, Jr., for the PEC. And I will be  
 13 on for portions of today but not the  
 14 entire duration.  
 15 MR. PIFKO: All right.  
 16 - - -  
 17 EXAMINATION  
 18 - - -  
 19 BY MR. PIFKO:  
 20 Q. Ready to begin?  
 21 A. Yes, sir.  
 22 Q. You understand that you're under  
 23 oath.  
 24

Page 13

1 A. Yes, sir.  
 2 Q. Correct?  
 3 Okay. And that means that you  
 4 are under penalty of perjury. And if you are  
 5 intentionally dishonest or misleading, that you  
 6 could be subject to penalties from the court.  
 7 Do you understand that?  
 8 A. I understand.  
 9 Q. Okay. Is there any reason why  
 10 you're unable to give truthful and accurate  
 11 testimony today?  
 12 A. No.  
 13 Q. Are you undergoing any medical  
 14 treatment or taking any medications that would  
 15 impact your ability to tell the truth?  
 16 A. No.  
 17 Q. Are you undergoing any treatment  
 18 or taking any medication that would impact your  
 19 memory?  
 20 A. No.  
 21 Q. Is there any reason why this  
 22 deposition shouldn't go forward, as far as you  
 23 know?  
 24 A. As far as I know.

Page 14

1 Q. Okay. So you were deposed a few  
2 months ago or so in this case.  
3 Do you recall?  
4 A. I do.  
5 Q. Okay. One of the things we  
6 discussed in your prior deposition was your work  
7 history with your current employer.  
8 Do you recall that?  
9 A. Yes.  
10 Q. During your last deposition, we  
11 discussed how one of the things that you did was  
12 you established the Orlando facility for the  
13 company.  
14 Do you recall that discussion?  
15 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
16 THE WITNESS: I didn't establish  
17 it alone. I was the operations manager.  
18 BY MR. PIFKO:  
19 Q. Okay.  
20 A. When it was opened, yes.  
21 Q. But you were one of the people  
22 who was responsible for establishing the Orlando  
23 facility. Correct?  
24 A. That's right.

Page 15

1 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
2 BY MR. PIFKO:  
3 Q. You moved from, I believe you  
4 were in Kentucky or Tennessee?  
5 A. Tennessee.  
6 Q. Okay. Tennessee. You moved from  
7 there to Orlando in order to help establish the  
8 Orlando facility. Correct?  
9 A. That's correct.  
10 Q. And then you -- what was your  
11 first role at the Orlando facility?  
12 MS. McCLURE: Objection, asked  
13 and answered.  
14 THE WITNESS: I was the  
15 operations manager.  
16 BY MR. PIFKO:  
17 Q. And did you have that role the  
18 whole time that you were there?  
19 A. Not the whole time, no.  
20 Q. What was your most senior role  
21 when you left the Orlando facility?  
22 MS. McCLURE: Objection, asked  
23 and answered, form.  
24 THE WITNESS: Operations manager

Page 16

1 was the most senior role.  
2 BY MR. PIFKO:  
3 Q. And then later you became an  
4 auditor. Correct?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. And part of your responsibilities  
7 involved auditing the facilities, including the  
8 Orlando facility. Correct?  
9 A. Originally not the Orlando  
10 facility.  
11 Q. But ultimately you did have  
12 responsibilities that included auditing the  
13 Orlando facility. Correct?  
14 A. I believe --  
15 MS. McCLURE: Objection, asked  
16 and answered.  
17 THE WITNESS: I believe that was  
18 in my area of responsibility, yes.  
19 BY MR. PIFKO:  
20 Q. Are you familiar with the order  
21 to show cause that was issued concerning the  
22 Orlando facility?  
23 A. Yes.  
24 MS. McCLURE: Objection, asked

Page 17

1 and answered.  
2 Are we doing a continuation of  
3 the exhibit numbering?  
4 MR. PIFKO: We're calling it  
5 Volume 2.  
6 MS. McCLURE: Thank you.  
7 - - -  
8 (Deposition Exhibit No. Mays  
9 V2-1, Order to Show Cause and Immediate  
10 Suspension of Registration, Bates stamped  
11 ABDCMDL00269383 through ABDCMDL00269387,  
12 was marked for identification.)  
13 - - -  
14 BY MR. PIFKO:  
15 Q. I'm handing you what's marked as  
16 Exhibit 1. Volume 2, Exhibit 1.  
17 For the record, it's a letter  
18 from the DEA dated April 19, 2007, Bates labeled  
19 ABDCMDL00269383 through 387.  
20 Have you seen this exhibit  
21 before?  
22 MS. McCLURE: The document or the  
23 exhibit?  
24 THE WITNESS: I've seen this

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p> <p>1 document before, yes.</p> <p>2 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>3 Q. Can you tell me what this is?</p> <p>4 A. It is an order to show cause and</p> <p>5 immediate suspension of the Orlando registration.</p> <p>6 Q. When was the last time you saw</p> <p>7 this document?</p> <p>8 A. I can't recall.</p> <p>9 Q. Is this something that you</p> <p>10 reviewed in preparing for your deposition?</p> <p>11 A. No.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Do you believe you saw</p> <p>13 this on or around the time it was issued in April</p> <p>14 of 2007?</p> <p>15 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Sometime after the</p> <p>17 suspension. I didn't see it immediately.</p> <p>18 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. But sometime on or</p> <p>20 around -- it was -- after it was issued, it was</p> <p>21 provided to you. Correct?</p> <p>22 A. That's correct.</p> <p>23 Q. Who would have provided it to</p> <p>24 you?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p> <p>1 order to show cause?</p> <p>2 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what</p> <p>4 that -- I'm not sure what you mean by</p> <p>5 changes operationally.</p> <p>6 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>7 Q. Well, let's go through and see --</p> <p>8 let's look at Exhibit 1 and see what the</p> <p>9 Department of Justice said to AmerisourceBergen</p> <p>10 in this letter.</p> <p>11 It said, "Respondent" -- you see</p> <p>12 on the first page here, there's a number of</p> <p>13 paragraphs, starting about halfway down.</p> <p>14 It says, "Respondent has failed</p> <p>15 to maintain effective controls against diversion</p> <p>16 of particular controlled substances into other</p> <p>17 than legitimate medical, scientific and</p> <p>18 industrial channels, in violation of 21 U.S.C.</p> <p>19 Sections 823(b)(1) and (e)(1)."</p> <p>20 Do you see that?</p> <p>21 A. I do.</p> <p>22 Q. Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>23 A. I believe you did.</p> <p>24 Q. And then it says, "From January</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p> <p>1 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: I don't recall.</p> <p>3 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>4 Q. Were you part of discussions</p> <p>5 about what was going to be done to respond to</p> <p>6 this order to show cause?</p> <p>7 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: Internally or with</p> <p>9 DEA?</p> <p>10 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>11 Q. Internally.</p> <p>12 A. Internally. Yes. I was part of</p> <p>13 some discussions, yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Who did you discuss this order to</p> <p>15 show cause with?</p> <p>16 A. My boss, Chris Zimmerman.</p> <p>17 Q. Anyone else?</p> <p>18 A. Not that I remember.</p> <p>19 Q. What was the nature of your</p> <p>20 discussion with Mr. Zimmerman?</p> <p>21 A. I don't recall exactly.</p> <p>22 Q. Did you discuss that you were</p> <p>23 going to make any changes to the operations at</p> <p>24 the Orlando facility as a result of seeing this</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p> <p>1 1, 2006, through January 31, 2007, Respondent</p> <p>2 distributed over 3.8 million dosage units of</p> <p>3 combination hydrocodone products to customers</p> <p>4 that it knew or should have known were diverting</p> <p>5 the hydrocodone into other than legitimate</p> <p>6 medical, scientific and industrial channels."</p> <p>7 Do you see that?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>9 Q. Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>10 A. I think you did.</p> <p>11 Q. Did you understand at the time</p> <p>12 that that was a concern raised by the Department</p> <p>13 of Justice with respect to AmerisourceBergen?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, I understand that.</p> <p>15 MS. McCLURE: Objection to the</p> <p>16 form.</p> <p>17 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>18 Q. Did you have an understanding</p> <p>19 about what the specific basis was for that</p> <p>20 concern?</p> <p>21 MS. McCLURE: Objection to the</p> <p>22 form.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat that</p> <p>24 question again?</p>



<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>2 Q. So it says here that</p> <p>3 AmerisourceBergen failed to maintain effective</p> <p>4 controls against diversion. And then it says</p> <p>5 that AmerisourceBergen distributed over</p> <p>6 3.8 million dosage units of combination</p> <p>7 hydrocodone products to customers that it knew or</p> <p>8 should have known were diverting them.</p> <p>9 Did I read that -- summarize it</p> <p>10 correctly?</p> <p>11 A. I just asked you to repeat the</p> <p>12 question.</p> <p>13 Q. Yeah. Did I summarize that</p> <p>14 correctly?</p> <p>15 A. I think you did.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. So my question is, do you</p> <p>17 have an understanding about the specific basis of</p> <p>18 why the Department of Justice said that?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. What is your</p> <p>21 understanding?</p> <p>22 A. That the Department of Justice</p> <p>23 felt like we were shipping a large quantity to --</p> <p>24 of hydrocodone combination products to customers</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 Justice they were wrong. Correct?</p> <p>2 MS. McCCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>4 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>5 Q. Sitting here today, you're not</p> <p>6 aware of anyone responding to the Department of</p> <p>7 Justice in connection with this and saying the</p> <p>8 sales figures you're providing in your letter are</p> <p>9 incorrect.</p> <p>10 Would you agree with that?</p> <p>11 MS. McCCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: Again, I don't know</p> <p>13 what was said.</p> <p>14 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>15 Q. What was your title at this time?</p> <p>16 A. 2007, I would have -- I believe I</p> <p>17 was director of regulatory affairs.</p> <p>18 Q. Were the policies and procedures</p> <p>19 at the Orlando facility consistent with the</p> <p>20 company's policies around the country?</p> <p>21 MS. McCCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: Yes, they were.</p> <p>23 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>24 Q. So with respect to diversion</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 in Florida, in their opinion.</p> <p>2 Q. Were you in fact shipping the</p> <p>3 quantities that they said you were shipping?</p> <p>4 A. I can't verify that to the</p> <p>5 number.</p> <p>6 Q. Do you recall ever --</p> <p>7 A. I'm sure -- go ahead.</p> <p>8 Q. Do you recall ever disputing</p> <p>9 that the numbers that they were providing were</p> <p>10 incorrect?</p> <p>11 MS. McCCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I don't recall that</p> <p>13 we disputed it, no.</p> <p>14 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>15 Q. So to your recollection, you</p> <p>16 never told the Department of Justice their</p> <p>17 numbers were wrong. Agreed?</p> <p>18 MS. McCCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I wasn't involved</p> <p>20 in the discussions with the Department of</p> <p>21 Justice.</p> <p>22 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. But to your knowledge, no</p> <p>24 one at AmerisourceBergen told the Department of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 control, there was nothing different going on at</p> <p>2 the Orlando facility than there was at any other</p> <p>3 facility. Correct?</p> <p>4 MS. McCCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Not that I know of.</p> <p>6 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>7 Q. Do you know why you said earlier</p> <p>8 that the Department of Justice was concerned</p> <p>9 about the volume of these products, these</p> <p>10 hydrocodone combination products, that were being</p> <p>11 sold to customers? Agreed?</p> <p>12 MS. McCCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: I agree that</p> <p>14 they -- I would assume they were</p> <p>15 concerned or they wouldn't have suspended</p> <p>16 the registration.</p> <p>17 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>18 Q. Why were they concerned about</p> <p>19 these volumes?</p> <p>20 MS. McCCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>22 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>23 Q. You have no idea why this was a</p> <p>24 concern?</p>



Page 26

1 MS. McCLURE: Same objection.  
2 THE WITNESS: I didn't have any  
3 conversations with DEA about it, so I  
4 don't know how they formed that opinion.  
5 BY MR. PIFKO:  
6 Q. Well, let's go to the second page  
7 here.  
8 Again, there's numbered  
9 paragraphs. There's a paragraph number 5 at the  
10 bottom there.  
11 A. Okay.  
12 Q. I'm going to read it to you, and  
13 tell me if I read it correctly.  
14 It says, "On August 10, 2005, DEA  
15 personnel met with Steve Mays, Respondent's  
16 Director of Regulatory Affairs, to inform him  
17 about the common characteristics of pharmacies  
18 that divert large amounts of controlled  
19 substances by filling invalid prescriptions  
20 obtained by customers using the Internet."  
21 Do you see that?  
22 A. Yes, I do.  
23 Q. Did I read that correctly?  
24 A. Yes, you did.

Page 27

1 Q. Do you recall having a meeting  
2 with DEA personnel on August 10, 2005?  
3 MS. McCLURE: Objection, asked  
4 and answered.  
5 THE WITNESS: I don't recall if  
6 that was the exact date, but I do recall  
7 the meeting, yes.  
8 BY MR. PIFKO:  
9 Q. Does this refresh your  
10 recollection about what your title was on or  
11 around this time?  
12 A. Yes.  
13 Q. Okay. So when it says here that  
14 you were director of regulatory affairs, is that  
15 correct?  
16 A. That's correct.  
17 Q. Was that your title on or around  
18 the time that this order to show cause was  
19 issued?  
20 MS. McCLURE: Objection, asked  
21 and answered.  
22 THE WITNESS: I think so, yes.  
23 BY MR. PIFKO:  
24 Q. So you recall having this meeting

Page 28

1 with the DEA, correct --  
2 A. Yes, I do.  
3 Q. -- in 2005?  
4 MS. McCLURE: Objection, asked  
5 and answered.  
6 BY MR. PIFKO:  
7 Q. Who was present at this meeting?  
8 MS. McCLURE: Objection, asked  
9 and answered.  
10 THE WITNESS: Myself and Mike  
11 Mates (ph) from DEA. And then there was  
12 an attorney there, counsel, that I don't  
13 recall his name.  
14 BY MR. PIFKO:  
15 Q. Attorney for the Department of  
16 Justice?  
17 A. Yes. Or for DEA.  
18 Q. Okay. Was there anyone else from  
19 AmerisourceBergen who was present at this  
20 meeting?  
21 MS. McCLURE: Objection, asked  
22 and answered.  
23 THE WITNESS: No, there wasn't.  
24 BY MR. PIFKO:

Page 29

1 Q. Do you agree with the  
2 characterization in this letter that at that  
3 meeting they informed you about the common  
4 characteristics of pharmacies that divert large  
5 amounts of controlled substances by filling  
6 invalid prescriptions obtained by customers using  
7 the internet?  
8 A. Yes.  
9 Q. It says, going on to page 3, "DEA  
10 personnel reminded Respondent that under 21  
11 U.S.C. Sections 823(b)(1) and (e)(1), Respondent  
12 was responsible to prevent the diversion of  
13 controlled substances."  
14 Do you see that?  
15 A. I see that, yes.  
16 Q. Did I read that correctly?  
17 A. Yes, you did.  
18 Q. Do you recall the DEA informing  
19 you during that meeting that AmerisourceBergen  
20 was responsible for preventing diversion of  
21 controlled substances?  
22 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
23 THE WITNESS: I don't recall that  
24 specifically.

Page 30

1 BY MR. PIFKO:  
2 Q. How about generally?  
3 MS. McCLURE: Same.  
4 THE WITNESS: Same.  
5 BY MR. PIFKO:  
6 Q. Do you recall during that meeting  
7 the DEA discussing AmerisourceBergen's  
8 responsibilities under the Controlled Substances  
9 Act?  
10 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
11 THE WITNESS: Not specifically.  
12 BY MR. PIFKO:  
13 Q. How about generally, do you  
14 remember --  
15 A. That was 12 years ago.  
16 Q. Okay. How about generally, do  
17 you remember them discussing any expectations  
18 about what AmerisourceBergen was supposed to do  
19 with respect to complying with the Controlled  
20 Substances Act?  
21 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
22 THE WITNESS: Not specifically.  
23 BY MR. PIFKO:  
24 Q. How about generally?

Page 31

1 MS. McCLURE: Same objection.  
2 THE WITNESS: Not -- not  
3 generally.  
4 BY MR. PIFKO:  
5 Q. So you don't have any  
6 recollection of whether you discussed the  
7 Controlled Substances Act at that meeting?  
8 MS. McCLURE: Objection, asked  
9 and answered.  
10 THE WITNESS: Not specifically.  
11 BY MR. PIFKO:  
12 Q. When you left that meeting, you  
13 reported back to Chris Zimmerman. Correct?  
14 MS. McCLURE: Objection, asked  
15 and answered.  
16 THE WITNESS: I don't recall that  
17 I did.  
18 BY MR. PIFKO:  
19 Q. Did you tell anybody about that  
20 meeting?  
21 MS. McCLURE: Same objection.  
22 THE WITNESS: Not -- I don't  
23 recall specifically. I'm sure I did, but  
24 I don't recall specifically.

Page 32

1 BY MR. PIFKO:  
2 Q. Who would you have told if you  
3 told someone?  
4 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form,  
5 calls for speculation.  
6 THE WITNESS: I would have to  
7 speculate. I don't know. I couldn't  
8 tell you for sure. Again, that was 12  
9 years ago.  
10 BY MR. PIFKO:  
11 Q. Okay. Next sentence here,  
12 "Notwithstanding the information provided to  
13 Respondent, after the August 10, 2005 meeting,  
14 Respondent sold over 5.2 million dosage units of  
15 hydrocodone to pharmacies that bore the  
16 characteristics that DEA described in the August  
17 10, 2005 meeting."  
18 Do you see that?  
19 A. Yes, I do.  
20 Q. Did I read that correctly?  
21 A. I believe you did.  
22 Q. Do you agree with that statement?  
23 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
24 THE WITNESS: I can't verify the

Page 33

1 quantities.  
2 BY MR. PIFKO:  
3 Q. Other than verifying the  
4 quantities, do you agree with that statement?  
5 MS. McCLURE: Same objection.  
6 THE WITNESS: I can't really  
7 agree with it because I don't -- I don't  
8 know. I don't recall.  
9 BY MR. PIFKO:  
10 Q. You don't know either way?  
11 A. No.  
12 Q. Do you have any reason to dispute  
13 that AmerisourceBergen sold over 5.2 million  
14 dosage units of hydrocodone products to  
15 pharmacies that bore the characteristics  
16 discussed at this August 10, 2005 meeting?  
17 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
18 THE WITNESS: I don't have any  
19 specific reason to dispute it, no.  
20 BY MR. PIFKO:  
21 Q. Do you remember the DEA  
22 discussing specific characteristics of  
23 hydrocodone products during the August 10, 2005  
24 meeting?

Page 34

1 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form,  
2 asked and answered.  
3 THE WITNESS: Characteristics of  
4 hydrocodone products? Not that I recall.  
5 BY MR. PIFKO:  
6 Q. How about do you recall DEA  
7 describing certain characteristics of sales to  
8 certain types of pharmacies?  
9 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
10 THE WITNESS: I recall that, yes.  
11 BY MR. PIFKO:  
12 Q. What specifically do you recall  
13 about that?  
14 A. We discussed characteristics of  
15 internet pharmacy and what to look for.  
16 Q. What specifically were you  
17 supposed to look for with respect to internet  
18 pharmacies?  
19 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
20 THE WITNESS: I don't recall  
21 everything. A few things. I can tell  
22 you what I do remember.  
23 BY MR. PIFKO:  
24 Q. Yeah, that's what I'm asking.

Page 35

1 A. Okay. I'm trying to recall.  
2 To look for like FedEx boxes or  
3 UPS boxes piled up in the pharmacy that would  
4 indicate they're shipping drugs other than just  
5 filling them at the store. Other than that, I  
6 can't remember the specifics.  
7 Q. When you came back to this  
8 meeting, did you instruct anyone at  
9 AmerisourceBergen to look for those type of  
10 characteristics?  
11 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
12 THE WITNESS: I don't recall  
13 specifically.  
14 BY MR. PIFKO:  
15 Q. How about generally?  
16 MS. McCLURE: Same.  
17 THE WITNESS: I'm sure I did, I  
18 just don't recall.  
19 BY MR. PIFKO:  
20 Q. Who would you have told?  
21 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
22 THE WITNESS: Don't recall  
23 specifically.  
24 BY MR. PIFKO:

Page 36

1 Q. Do you recall writing anything  
2 down to change AmerisourceBergen's procedures  
3 with respect to the due diligence it may perform  
4 with respect to customers after you had this  
5 meeting?  
6 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
7 THE WITNESS: I don't recall  
8 writing things down.  
9 BY MR. PIFKO:  
10 Q. Do you recall changing any  
11 policies or procedures in order to look for the  
12 criteria that the Department of Justice  
13 identified to you during this meeting?  
14 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form,  
15 assumes facts not in evidence,  
16 foundation.  
17 THE WITNESS: I don't recall  
18 specifically.  
19 BY MR. PIFKO:  
20 Q. How about generally?  
21 MS. McCLURE: Same.  
22 THE WITNESS: Generally, I know  
23 we made some changes.  
24 BY MR. PIFKO:

Page 37

1 [REDACTED]  
2 [REDACTED]  
3 [REDACTED]  
4 [REDACTED]  
5 [REDACTED]  
6 [REDACTED]  
7 [REDACTED]  
8 [REDACTED]  
9 [REDACTED]  
10 [REDACTED]  
11 [REDACTED]  
12 [REDACTED]  
13 [REDACTED]  
14 [REDACTED]  
15 [REDACTED]  
16 [REDACTED]  
17 [REDACTED]  
18 [REDACTED]  
19 [REDACTED]  
20 [REDACTED]  
21 [REDACTED]  
22 [REDACTED]  
23 [REDACTED]  
24 [REDACTED],

Page 38

[REDACTED]

Page 40

[REDACTED]

17 Q. Starting where we left off, it  
18 says, "Respondent continued to sell controlled  
19 substances to Grand, Discount Mail Meds and" Med  
20 Assistant "even though Respondent knew, or should  
21 have known, that these pharmacies were diverting  
22 controlled substances into other than legitimate  
23 medical, scientific and industrial channels."  
24 Do you see that?

Page 39

[REDACTED]

Page 41

1 A. Yes, I see that.  
2 Q. Did I read that correctly?  
3 A. Yes, you did.  
4 Q. If you go back to page 2,  
5 paragraph 3, it talks about how AmerisourceBergen  
6 distributed approximately a million dosage units  
7 of hydrocodone products to Grand Pharmacy.  
8 Do you see that?  
9 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
10 THE WITNESS: I do.  
11 BY MR. PIFKO:  
12 Q. Did I read that correct -- did I  
13 summarize that correctly?  
14 A. I believe you did.  
15 Q. Okay. And then in paragraph 4,  
16 it talks about supplying hydrocodone products to  
17 a number of other pharmacies.  
18 Do you see that?  
19 A. Yes, I do.  
20 Q. And then it says in paragraph 4  
21 that the distribution of those was under  
22 circumstances that should have alerted  
23 AmerisourceBergen that the pharmacies were  
24 diverting hydrocodone.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>1 Do you see that?</p> <p>2 A. You said paragraph 4?</p> <p>3 Q. Yeah. The last sentence in the</p> <p>4 bottom of that first paragraph there.</p> <p>5 A. Okay. I see it.</p> <p>6 Q. Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Do you believe that the</p> <p>9 policies and procedures that you implemented</p> <p>10 after this August 2005 meeting were sufficient to</p> <p>11 detect diversion?</p> <p>12 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: I believe that the</p> <p>14 actions that we took enabled us to</p> <p>15 identify internet pharmacies. And I</p> <p>16 think we ceased distributing to some of</p> <p>17 these. I can't tell you exactly which</p> <p>18 ones, but I believe we cut those off.</p> <p>19 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>20 Q. After you received this letter?</p> <p>21 A. No. I think some of these were</p> <p>22 cut off before this action was taken. I can't --</p> <p>23 I don't remember specifically which ones, but I</p> <p>24 do recall that when this happened, some of these</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>1 have known that they were diverting them to</p> <p>2 illegitimate channels, you still feel like the</p> <p>3 company was doing enough, as the director of</p> <p>4 regulatory affairs?</p> <p>5 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: I felt like we were</p> <p>7 doing the best we could as a distributor</p> <p>8 to comply with the regulations. And we</p> <p>9 took steps to improve our due diligence</p> <p>10 and our monitoring of our customers.</p> <p>11 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>12 Q. Do you believe you took adequate</p> <p>13 steps to improve your due diligence and monitor</p> <p>14 customers?</p> <p>15 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>17 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>18 Q. Going to page 3 here, it says, in</p> <p>19 the middle of the second paragraph -- tell me</p> <p>20 when you're there -- "it is my preliminary</p> <p>21 conclusion that Respondent's continued</p> <p>22 registration while these proceedings are pending</p> <p>23 would constitute an imminent danger to the public</p> <p>24 health and safety because of the substantial</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>1 customers that were mentioned, we had cut off</p> <p>2 before the suspension.</p> <p>3 Q. Did receiving this letter cause</p> <p>4 AmerisourceBergen to be concerned that it wasn't</p> <p>5 doing enough to comply with diversion control</p> <p>6 laws and regulations?</p> <p>7 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: I couldn't tell you</p> <p>9 what the company thought.</p> <p>10 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>11 Q. How about you? You were</p> <p>12 regulatory affairs manager.</p> <p>13 A. Director.</p> <p>14 Q. Director.</p> <p>15 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>16 Q. Did you feel like the company was</p> <p>17 doing enough to prevent diversion when you</p> <p>18 received this order to show cause?</p> <p>19 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.</p> <p>21 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>22 Q. So even though the Department of</p> <p>23 Justice said that you were distributing</p> <p>24 substances to customers when you knew or should</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 likelihood that Respondent will continue to</p> <p>2 supply pharmacies that divert large quantities of</p> <p>3 controlled substances."</p> <p>4 Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>5 A. Yes, you did.</p> <p>6 Q. Upon receiving that, did that</p> <p>7 give you, as the director of compliance and</p> <p>8 regulatory issues, concern about whether the</p> <p>9 company's practices were sufficient?</p> <p>10 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>12 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>13 Q. Did you think the Department of</p> <p>14 Justice's conclusions were wrong?</p> <p>15 A. I think so, yeah. They weren't</p> <p>16 completely accurate, in my opinion.</p> <p>17 Q. Why do you say that they weren't</p> <p>18 completely accurate?</p> <p>19 A. I can't really say. I just don't</p> <p>20 think they were completely accurate. I felt like</p> <p>21 we were doing the best we could to monitor the</p> <p>22 distribution of these drugs.</p> <p>23 Q. Do you have any factual basis to</p> <p>24 challenge that Department of Justice's conclusion</p>

1 there?

2 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form,  
3 asked and answered.

4 THE WITNESS: Not today I don't,  
5 no.

6 BY MR. PIFKO:

7 Q. Do you know what happened after  
8 you received -- the company received this letter?

9 MS. McCLURE: Form.

10 THE WITNESS: What do you mean,  
11 what happened?

12 BY MR. PIFKO:

13 Q. The Orlando facility did get its  
14 registration suspended. Correct?

15      A.    Yes, that's correct.

16 Q. And you had to halt shipments of  
17 product for some time period from that facility.  
18 Correct?

19 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.

20 THE WITNESS: Ask the question  
21 again, please, I'm sorry.

22 BY MR. PIFKO:

23 Q. You had to halt shipments of  
24 product from that facility for some period of

<sup>1</sup> BY MR. PIFKO:

2 Q. Are you aware of any other  
3 actions where the DEA was investigating the  
4 company for potential violations of diversion  
5 control laws?

6       A.    I -- actions -- I mean, I can't  
7 recall specifics.

8 Q. How about generally?

9 A. There's always investigations.  
10 They inspect our facilities frequently, and there  
11 could -- there's always -- I shouldn't say  
12 always, but often there's minor violations that  
13 are part of their investigation, part of the  
14 Controlled Substances Act and the regulations.

15 Q. Do you recall any criminal  
16 investigations that were occurring with respect  
17 to AmerisourceBergen's diversion control  
18 practices?

[illegible]

<sup>1</sup> time after that. Correct?

2 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.

3 THE WITNESS: We had to halt  
4 shipments of controlled substances from  
5 the facility.

6 BY MR. PIFKO:

7 Q. Do you know how long that was in  
8 place, where you weren't allowed to ship  
9 controlled substances from that facility?

10           A. I couldn't tell you exactly, but  
11 it was about three months.

12 Q. Some years later, the Houston  
13 facility also almost lost its registration.

14 Correct?

15 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.

16 THE WITNESS: I don't know what  
17 you're talking about.

18 BY MR. PIFKO:

19 Q. You don't have any recollection  
20 of the DEA almost suspending the registration of  
21 the Houston facility?

22 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.

23 THE WITNESS: I have no  
24 knowledge. No knowledge of that.

[illegible]



Page 50

[REDACTED]

Page 52

[REDACTED]

Page 51

[REDACTED]

Page 53

[REDACTED]

[illegible]

1 MS. McCLURE: Objection, asked  
2 and answered.  
3 THE WITNESS: Would that be prior  
4 to the suspension?  
5 BY MR. PIFKO:  
6 Q. Yes.  
7 A. Is that what you're asking?  
8 Q. Yes.  
9 A. As I recall, it would be the same  
10 as any of the other facilities.  
11 Q. Okay. So at the time this letter  
12 was sent, AmerisourceBergen's diversion control  
13 systems were the same at all of its distribution  
14 centers. Correct?  
15 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
16 THE WITNESS: That's what I  
17 recall, yes.  
18 BY MR. PIFKO:  
19 Q. So anything occurring at this  
20 Orlando facility could be occurring at any other  
21 distribution center. Correct?  
22 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  
23 THE WITNESS: I disagree.  
24 BY MR. PIFKO:

5 MR. PIFKO: Let's take a short  
6 break.  
7 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the  
8 record at 11:50 a.m.  
9 - - -  
10 (A recess was taken from  
11 11:50 a.m. to 12:07 p.m.)  
12 - - -  
13 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the  
14 record at 12:07 p.m.  
15 BY MR. PIFKO:  
16 Q. I want to bring your attention  
17 back to Exhibit 1.  
18 A. Okay.  
19 Q. All right. So I just want to  
20 confirm, as we discussed before we went on the  
21 break, there was nothing different about the  
22 procedures at the Orlando facility as opposed to  
23 any other facility, any other distribution  
24 facility ran by AmerisourceBergen. Correct?

[illegible]

Page 58

1 [REDACTED]  
2 [REDACTED]  
3 [REDACTED]  
4 [REDACTED]  
5 [REDACTED]  
6 [REDACTED]  
7 [REDACTED]  
8 [REDACTED]  
9 [REDACTED]  
10 [REDACTED]  
11 [REDACTED]  
12 [REDACTED]  
13 [REDACTED]  
14 [REDACTED]  
15 [REDACTED]  
16 BY MR. PIFKO:  
17 Q. Let's go to page 2 of Exhibit 1.  
18 A. Okay.  
19 Q. So looking at paragraph 4, it  
20 says, the bottom of paragraph 4, "Respondent  
21 distributed hydrocodone under the following  
22 circumstances that should have alerted Respondent  
23 that the pharmacies were diverting hydrocodone."  
24 Do you see that?

Page 59

1 A. Yes, I do.  
2 Q. Did I read that correctly?  
3 A. Yes, you did.  
4 Q. Then it's got subparts A through  
5 D.  
6 Do you see those?  
7 A. Yes, I do.  
8 Q. Part A says, "Respondent  
9 distributed hydrocodone to each of the named  
10 pharmacies, and others, in amounts that far  
11 exceeded what an average pharmacy orders to meet  
12 the legitimate needs of its customers."  
13 Do you see that?  
14 A. Yes, I do.  
15 Q. Did I read that correctly?  
16 A. Yes, you did.  
17 Q. "Respondent knew that orders of  
18 an unusual size were 'suspicious' as that term is  
19 used in 21 C.F.R. section 1301.74(b)."  
20 Did I read that correctly?  
21 A. Yes, you did.  
22 Q. What was AmerisourceBergen's  
23 system that was in place to monitor the amounts  
24 that its customers ordered --

Page 60

1 MS. McCLURE: Objection.  
2 BY MR. PIFKO:  
3 Q. -- at that time?  
4 MS. McCLURE: Asked and answered.  
5 THE WITNESS: As I recall, it was  
6 a system that generated a report that  
7 indicated any orders that were above  
8 certain parameters looking back over that  
9 customer's average purchases. And they  
10 would be flagged on that report if they  
11 exceeded that average or that parameter.  
12 BY MR. PIFKO:  
13 Q. So you agree here that the DEA is  
14 saying in this letter that AmerisourceBergen  
15 nevertheless distributed hydrocodone to  
16 pharmacies even though the amounts exceeded what  
17 an average pharmacy would order for legitimate  
18 needs.  
19 Do you see that?  
20 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  
21 THE WITNESS: You're on the  
22 subparagraph A?  
23 BY MR. PIFKO:  
24 Q. Yes.

Page 61

1 A. I agree that that's what DEA is  
2 saying, yes.  
3 Q. So did AmerisourceBergen at this  
4 time not have a way of monitoring what a  
5 customer's volume was with -- as compared to what  
6 an average pharmacy would need to meet legitimate  
7 needs of its customers?  
8 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  
9 THE WITNESS: I don't recall the  
10 specific algorithms of that program.  
11 BY MR. PIFKO:  
12 Q. You believe there was a program  
13 that had algorithms?  
14 A. I'm sorry?  
15 Q. You believe there was a program  
16 that had some algorithm?  
17 A. I don't know if algorithm is a  
18 correct word, but it had a formula built into the  
19 system, a certain percentage. And it basically  
20 looked at that customer's purchases over, I  
21 believe it was -- I believe it was a rolling  
22 three-month average. And if it exceeded that by  
23 a certain amount, then it would be flagged on  
24 this report as a possible excessive order.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 Q. But according to DEA, you failed  2 to alert DEA and you failed to prevent orders of  3 unusual size from being shipped to customers.  4 Correct?</p> <p>5 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  6 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat that  7 again? I'm sorry.  8 BY MR. PIFKO:  9 Q. Yes. So in A here it's saying  10 that you nevertheless shipped orders beyond what  11 an average pharmacy needed?  12 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  13 THE WITNESS: I don't know what  14 an average pharmacy needed.  15 BY MR. PIFKO:  16 Q. Okay.  17 A. So...  18 Q. So at the time AmerisourceBergen  19 had no way of evaluating what an average pharmacy  20 needed; is that correct?  21 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  22 THE WITNESS: We only had the  23 ability to know what our customers were  24 purchasing.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 MS. McCLURE: Objection, asked  2 and answered.  3 THE WITNESS: I see that in  4 general, yes.  5 BY MR. PIFKO:  6 Q. And if you go on the first page  7 here, it says that, in paragraph 1, "Respondent  8 distributed over 3.8 million dosage units of  9 combination hydrocodone products to customers  10 that it knew or should have known were diverting  11 the hydrocodone into other than legitimate  12 medical, scientific and industrial channels."  13 Do you see that?  14 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  15 THE WITNESS: I see that.  16 BY MR. PIFKO:  17 Q. And so my question to you is,  18 there's a failure of AmerisourceBergen to catch  19 this volumes that the Department of Justice  20 identified. Correct?  21 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  22 THE WITNESS: In their opinion,  23 yes.  24 BY MR. PIFKO:</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 BY MR. PIFKO:  2 Q. Did you take any steps to know  3 what the average pharmacy within your own  4 customers would need to fill legitimate needs of  5 its customers?  6 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  7 THE WITNESS: I don't recall.  8 BY MR. PIFKO:  9 Q. Would you agree that there was a  10 failure of AmerisourceBergen's system that led to  11 the receipt of this order to show cause?  12 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  13 THE WITNESS: No, I don't agree  14 that there was a failure to our system.  15 BY MR. PIFKO:  16 Q. Going to page 3 here, the top  17 paragraph. We looked at this earlier.  18 A. Uh-huh.  19 Q. It said that AmerisourceBergen  20 shipped over 5.2 million dosage units of  21 hydrocodone to pharmacies that had certain  22 characteristics that were discussed in your  23 August 10, 2005 meeting.  24 Do you see that?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 Q. What I'm trying to understand is  2 where -- what occurred to result in that failure?  3 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  4 THE WITNESS: I didn't say there  5 was a failure.  6 BY MR. PIFKO:  7 Q. Did you not know that those  8 volumes of hydrocodone products were being  9 shipped to AmerisourceBergen customers?  10 A. I didn't know personally, no.  11 Q. Was the company doing anything to  12 monitor the potentially significant volumes of  13 hydrocodone products that were being shipped to  14 its customers?  15 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  16 THE WITNESS: We had a suspicious  17 order monitoring program.  18 BY MR. PIFKO:  19 Q. Okay. So did the system just not  20 catch these orders?  21 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  22 THE WITNESS: I couldn't tell you  23 that.  24 BY MR. PIFKO:</p>

Page 66

1 Q. Do you know if the system caught  
2 these orders and then they were simply released?  
3 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  
4 THE WITNESS: If these orders  
5 were suspicious, they would have been on  
6 that report and they would have been  
7 reported to DEA as suspicious.  
8 BY MR. PIFKO:  
9 Q. The DEA here is saying these  
10 orders are suspicious.  
11 Do you agree? Let's look at page  
12 2, paragraph 4a.  
13 MS. McCLURE: Objection.  
14 BY MR. PIFKO:  
15 Q. "Respondent knew that orders of  
16 an unusual size were 'suspicious' as that term is  
17 used in 21 C.F.R. Section 1301.74(b)."  
18 MS. McCLURE: What's the  
19 question?  
20 THE WITNESS: Yeah.  
21 BY MR. PIFKO:  
22 Q. My question to you was, the DEA  
23 was saying these orders were suspicious.  
24 Correct?

Page 67

1 MS. McCLURE: Objection.  
2 Objection, form.  
3 THE WITNESS: I don't see where  
4 DEA says those orders were suspicious.  
5 BY MR. PIFKO:  
6 Q. Well, it's saying each of these  
7 pharmacies and others where you distributed  
8 hydrocodone products to them in amounts that far  
9 exceeded what an average pharmacy orders to meet  
10 the legitimate needs of its customers.  
11 Do you see that?  
12 A. Yes, I see that.  
13 Q. Okay. And it's talking about  
14 orders that AmerisourceBergen shipped to its  
15 customers. Correct?  
16 A. Yes, yes, that's correct.  
17 Q. And then it says, you knew that  
18 orders of an unusual size were suspicious.  
19 Do you see that?  
20 A. I see that.  
21 Q. Did you not know that the orders  
22 that exceeded what an average pharmacy would need  
23 were suspicious?  
24 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.

Page 68

1 THE WITNESS: Again, I don't know  
2 what an average pharmacy's purchases  
3 were.  
4 BY MR. PIFKO:  
5 Q. Okay. So AmerisourceBergen had  
6 no steps to monitor what an average pharmacy's  
7 needs were at that time.  
8 MS. McCLURE: Objection.  
9 BY MR. PIFKO:  
10 Q. Is that correct?  
11 A. That's --  
12 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form,  
13 asked and answered and misstates the  
14 witness's prior testimony.  
15 You may answer.  
16 THE WITNESS: I disagree. We  
17 have a suspicious order monitoring  
18 program.  
19 BY MR. PIFKO:  
20 Q. Okay. But you just said, I don't  
21 know what an average pharmacy would need.  
22 A. That's correct.  
23 Q. Did AmerisourceBergen have any  
24 policies or procedures in place to evaluate what

Page 69

1 an average pharmacy might need?  
2 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  
3 THE WITNESS: We have a  
4 suspicious order monitoring program to  
5 monitor our own customers. We don't  
6 know -- we didn't know what an average  
7 pharmacy purchased, what the quantities  
8 were for an average pharmacy.  
9 BY MR. PIFKO:  
10 Q. So at that time, there was  
11 nothing in AmerisourceBergen's system to evaluate  
12 what an average pharmacy might need for its  
13 legitimate needs for its customers. Correct?  
14 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  
15 THE WITNESS: Not other than our  
16 own customers. That's the only data we  
17 have or that we had at that time.  
18 BY MR. PIFKO:  
19 Q. But you were saying, under  
20 AmerisourceBergen's systems in place at that  
21 time, it only monitored the average of each  
22 customer against its own orders at that time.  
23 Correct?  
24 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.

Page 70

1 THE WITNESS: That's what I  
2 recall, yes.  
3 BY MR. PIFKO:  
4 Q. You weren't undertaking any  
5 effort to compare a pharmacy's orders compared to  
6 another pharmacy's orders at that time. Correct?  
7 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
8 THE WITNESS: Not that I know of.  
9 BY MR. PIFKO:  
10 Q. Let's go to paragraph 4b.  
11 A. Okay.  
12 Q. It says, "Respondent distributed  
13 hydrocodone to each of the named pharmacies, and  
14 others, even though the pharmacies ordered small  
15 amounts of other drug products relative to the  
16 pharmacies' hydrocodone purchases from  
17 Respondent."  
18 Do you see that?  
19 A. Yes, I do.  
20 Q. "Respondent knew orders for large  
21 amounts of hydrocodone in combination with small  
22 amounts of other drug products deviated from the  
23 normal pattern of orders placed by pharmacies."  
24 Do you see that?

Page 71

1 A. I see that.  
2 Q. Did you know, as the head of  
3 regulatory and compliance issues for diversion  
4 control at that time, that an order for large  
5 amounts of hydrocodone as compared to other drug  
6 products was something that deviated from the  
7 normal pattern of ordering for a pharmacy?  
8 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  
9 THE WITNESS: Repeat the  
10 question, please?  
11 BY MR. PIFKO:  
12 Q. Did you know, as the head of  
13 regulatory and compliance issues for diversion  
14 control issues at that time, that an order for  
15 large amounts of hydrocodone, as compared to  
16 other drug products, was something that deviated  
17 from the normal pattern of ordering for a  
18 pharmacy?  
19 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
20 THE WITNESS: We were -- we  
21 monitored the purchases of that customer,  
22 compared to their previous purchases, is  
23 the way our system worked.  
24 BY MR. PIFKO:

Page 72

1 Q. Okay. Did you have any system in  
2 place to monitor its purchasing of Schedule II or  
3 III controlled substances as it compared to other  
4 types of substances?  
5 A. Not that I know of.  
6 Q. Let's go to paragraph 4c.  
7 It says, "Respondent distributed  
8 hydrocodone to each of the named pharmacies, and  
9 others, even though the pharmacies ordered  
10 hydrocodone much more frequently than  
11 Respondent's other pharmacy customers."  
12 Do you see that?  
13 A. Yes, I do.  
14 Q. Did I read that correctly?  
15 A. Yes, you did.  
16 Q. It says, "Respondent knew that  
17 orders of unusual frequency were 'suspicious' as  
18 that term is used in 21 C.F.R. Section  
19 1301.74(b)."  
20 Did I read that correct?  
21 A. That's correct.  
22 Q. Did AmerisourceBergen have any  
23 system in place at that time to evaluate the  
24 frequency of orders of controlled substances

Page 73

1 placed by its customers?  
2 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
3 THE WITNESS: Not that I know of.  
4 BY MR. PIFKO:  
5 Q. You said something earlier  
6 about -- that after the 2005 meeting with DEA  
7 that's referenced in here --  
8 A. Uh-huh.  
9 Q. And let's be specific, the one  
10 that's referenced in paragraph 5 of Exhibit 1.  
11 A. Okay.  
12 Q. You said that after that meeting,  
13 you initiated some sort of due diligence process.  
14 Correct?  
15 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  
16 THE WITNESS: That's correct.  
17 BY MR. PIFKO:  
18 Q. Prior to that time, did you have  
19 no due diligence process in place?  
20 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
21 THE WITNESS: Yes, we had due  
22 diligence. Yes.  
23 BY MR. PIFKO:  
24 Q. What due diligence process was in



Page 74

1 place before that meeting?

2 A. The same due diligence that we

3 had had in place for years.

4 Q. And what was it --

5 A. Do you want me to describe it?

6 Q. Yes.

7 A. Our responsibility was to make a

8 good faith effort to make sure that that

9 customer's properly licensed with the state and

10 registered with DEA.

11 Q. Anything else?

12 A. No.

13 Q. So at that time of the meeting in

14 2005, the only due diligence that was in place

15 was a process to make sure that the customer was

16 properly licensed; is that correct?

17 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.

18 THE WITNESS: Properly licensed

19 by the state and registered with DEA.

20 That was our requirement under the

21 federal regulations.

22 BY MR. PIFKO:

23 Q. How is it that AmerisourceBergen

24 missed these millions of orders in its suspicious

Page 75

1 order monitoring system, as discussed here in

2 Exhibit 1?

3 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form,

4 foundation.

5 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure we

6 missed them. I believe they were

7 reported to DEA as suspicious orders.

8 BY MR. PIFKO:

9 Q. It's your testimony that these

10 orders were picked up by the suspicious order

11 monitoring system and reported to DEA?

12 A. I'm not saying every one. I'm

13 just -- I know that, from what I recall, some of

14 these customers that were mentioned in here, as I

15 recall, had orders that were reported to DEA as

16 suspicious.

17 Q. Do you have any sense of the

18 percentage of the orders, if any, that were

19 caught?

20 A. No, I do not.

21 Q. If you reported these orders to

22 DEA, do you have any understanding as to why DEA

23 issued this order to show cause?

24 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.

Page 76

1 THE WITNESS: No, I don't.

2 BY MR. PIFKO:

3 Q. Did you do anything other than

4 report these orders to -- some of the orders that

5 you discussed to DEA to prevent diversion?

6 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.

7 THE WITNESS: Yes.

8 BY MR. PIFKO:

9 Q. What did you do?

10 A. We cut off -- I believe we cut

11 off some of these pharmacies, if not all of them.

12 I can't recall exactly which ones.

13 Q. Do you know how many you cut off?

14 A. Couldn't -- don't recall.

15 Q. Do you know when you cut them

16 off?

17 A. Either prior to the suspension or

18 after.

19 Q. So you cut some of them off maybe

20 after the suspension order?

21 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.

22 THE WITNESS: Well, it would have

23 been prior, because we weren't able to

24 ship after -- after the suspension order.

Page 77

1 So it would have been prior to that.

2 BY MR. PIFKO:

3 Q. Would that be contained in any

4 document?

5 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.

6 THE WITNESS: I'm sure -- no, I

7 don't want to speculate. I don't know.

8 BY MR. PIFKO:

9 Q. Based on your -- you've been with

10 the company for over 30 years. Right? Longer?

11 A. Longer.

12 Q. 40 years?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Based on your knowledge of the

15 company's practices and procedures, if you cut

16 off a customer, where would that be documented?

17 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.

18 THE WITNESS: It depends on what

19 system we're using to document things at

20 a specific time. We've changed

21 documentation processes over the years

22 many times.

23 BY MR. PIFKO:

24 Q. At the time of this order to show

Page 78

1 cause.  
2 MS. McCCLURE: Objection, form.  
3 THE WITNESS: Again, I'm not sure  
4 where it would have been documented.  
5 BY MR. PIFKO:  
6 Q. You don't know if it would have  
7 been documented at all?  
8 MS. McCCLURE: Objection, form,  
9 misstates the witness's prior testimony.  
10 THE WITNESS: I don't recall  
11 exactly.  
12 BY MR. PIFKO:  
13 Q. How about generally?  
14 A. Generally --  
15 MS. McCCLURE: Same objection.  
16 THE WITNESS: Generally, I would  
17 say that they were documented somewhere.  
18 BY MR. PIFKO:  
19 Q. Did you review anything in  
20 preparing for your deposition that would have  
21 discussed the company's shipments or orders  
22 from -- with respect to the pharmacies in  
23 Exhibit 1?  
24 MS. McCCLURE: Objection, form.

Page 79

1 THE WITNESS: No, no.  
2 BY MR. PIFKO:  
3 Q. If you were going to do that, how  
4 would you do that?  
5 MS. McCCLURE: Objection, form.  
6 THE WITNESS: How would I do  
7 what?  
8 BY MR. PIFKO:  
9 Q. If you were going to research the  
10 order history --  
11 A. Uh-huh.  
12 Q. -- and shipments made to any of  
13 the customers discussed in Exhibit 1, how would  
14 you go about doing that?  
15 MS. McCCLURE: Objection, form.  
16 THE WITNESS: I would go back to  
17 find out whatever system we were using to  
18 document and look through that and do a  
19 search.  
20 BY MR. PIFKO:  
21 Q. It's true that today you can log  
22 on to AmerisourceBergen's system and look back at  
23 customer histories and correspondence. Correct?  
24 MS. McCCLURE: Objection, form.

Page 80

1 THE WITNESS: I can't.  
2 BY MR. PIFKO:  
3 Q. You're unable to do that?  
4 A. Login to, which system are you  
5 talking about? Our business system?  
6 Q. AmerisourceBergen's diversion  
7 control systems.  
8 MS. McCCLURE: Objection, form.  
9 THE WITNESS: No. I don't login  
10 to that.  
11 BY MR. PIFKO:  
12 Q. Do members of your team login to  
13 that?  
14 MS. McCCLURE: Objection, form.  
15 THE WITNESS: Not on my team, no.  
16 BY MR. PIFKO:  
17 Q. Do you know who Eric Cherveney is?  
18 A. Yes, I do.  
19 Q. Is he someone that was under your  
20 team at any point?  
21 MS. McCCLURE: Objection, form.  
22 THE WITNESS: He was under my  
23 team back in, you know, I can't  
24 remember -- in the 2005 to 2010, sometime

Page 81

1 in that area.  
2 BY MR. PIFKO:  
3 Q. If he testified that you could go  
4 back and look into AmerisourceBergen's systems  
5 and get ordering information and information  
6 about a customer's history going back at least as  
7 early as 2000, would you have any reason to  
8 disagree with him?  
9 MS. McCCLURE: Objection, form.  
10 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure how  
11 you would, but maybe he can.  
12 BY MR. PIFKO:  
13 Q. With respect to these orders, you  
14 would have reported them after you shipped them.  
15 Correct?  
16 MS. McCCLURE: Objection, form.  
17 THE WITNESS: Which orders are  
18 you talking about specifically?  
19 BY MR. PIFKO:  
20 Q. The 5.2 million orders of  
21 hydrocodone products or dosage units discussed in  
22 Exhibit 1.  
23 MS. McCCLURE: Objection to form.  
24 THE WITNESS: At that time, they

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p> <p>1 would have been reported after.</p> <p>2 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>3 Q. None of these orders would have</p> <p>4 been reported prior to shipment. Correct?</p> <p>5 A. That's correct.</p> <p>6 Q. And all of these orders would</p> <p>7 have been shipped without any due diligence.</p> <p>8 Correct?</p> <p>9 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: That's incorrect.</p> <p>11 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>12 Q. Other than checking their</p> <p>13 registration?</p> <p>14 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Checking the</p> <p>16 registration, the licensing and all the</p> <p>17 other due diligence that we do on</p> <p>18 customers, whether it's credit, their</p> <p>19 ability to pay and whatever else that</p> <p>20 our -- there's different -- other parts</p> <p>21 of our due diligence that are done. But</p> <p>22 as far as controlled substances, it was</p> <p>23 the licensing.</p> <p>24 BY MR. PIFKO:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p> <p>1 decision would be made about that</p> <p>2 customer based on that due diligence.</p> <p>3 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>4 Q. Right. But my point is, there's</p> <p>5 no specific due diligence that you conduct with</p> <p>6 respect to an order?</p> <p>7 A. To each order?</p> <p>8 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>9 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>10 Q. Right.</p> <p>11 A. Not -- not for each specific</p> <p>12 order, no.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. So the only due diligence</p> <p>14 that would have been conducted would have been a</p> <p>15 collecting of a form and reviewing that form and</p> <p>16 deciding as a general matter whether to do</p> <p>17 business with that customer. Correct?</p> <p>18 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: That's -- that's</p> <p>20 incorrect. That's not correct.</p> <p>21 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>22 Q. What's incorrect about my</p> <p>23 statement?</p> <p>24 A. Well, the due diligence is</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. So the orders of the</p> <p>2 5.2 million dosage units that are discussed in</p> <p>3 Exhibit 1, the only due diligence with respect to</p> <p>4 diversion control that would have been performed</p> <p>5 on those would have been checking the licensing?</p> <p>6 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form,</p> <p>7 misstates the witness's prior testimony.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: Well, let me take</p> <p>9 you back, because actually, since 2005,</p> <p>10 after that meeting with DEA, we did put</p> <p>11 the due diligence process in place with</p> <p>12 questionnaires. And probably I'm sure a</p> <p>13 lot of these pharmacies had been -- had a</p> <p>14 due diligence investigation, had a</p> <p>15 questionnaire and a site visit.</p> <p>16 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>17 Q. But that's something you</p> <p>18 conducted -- it's static.</p> <p>19 You conduct the -- you collect</p> <p>20 the questionnaire, and it sits in a file.</p> <p>21 Correct?</p> <p>22 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: No. It gets</p> <p>24 reviewed. It would be reviewed, and a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p> <p>1 just -- that due diligence questionnaire is just</p> <p>2 part of the process. So any -- an order that</p> <p>3 would have shown up on that suspicious order</p> <p>4 report would have prompted a due diligence</p> <p>5 investigation --</p> <p>6 MS. McCLURE: Objection. Sorry.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: -- and a site</p> <p>8 visit.</p> <p>9 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>10 Q. So I'm getting mixed statements</p> <p>11 from you.</p> <p>12 You said that there was no</p> <p>13 specific due diligence with respect to an order;</p> <p>14 is that correct?</p> <p>15 A. Well, that due diligence could</p> <p>16 have been prompted by an order.</p> <p>17 Q. Explain that to me.</p> <p>18 A. Okay. So when we -- when we</p> <p>19 started doing the questionnaires, the basis for</p> <p>20 doing those questionnaires would have been that</p> <p>21 possible excessive and suspicious order report,</p> <p>22 and that's when that would prompt that</p> <p>23 questionnaire. So it is related to -- it would</p> <p>24 have been related to an order.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 86</p> <p>1 Q. How frequently --</p> <p>2 A. Or a customer's history.</p> <p>3 Q. How frequently would you collect</p> <p>4 this form from a customer?</p> <p>5 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>7 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>8 Q. For every single order that they</p> <p>9 would place that would be suspicious, you would</p> <p>10 collect another form?</p> <p>11 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>13 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>14 Q. Was it -- well, you were in</p> <p>15 charge of diversion control practices at the</p> <p>16 time. Correct?</p> <p>17 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I oversaw that</p> <p>19 area. That's part of regulatory at the</p> <p>20 time, yes.</p> <p>21 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>22 Q. And you don't know how the due</p> <p>23 diligence process worked?</p> <p>24 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 88</p> <p>1 Q. Every time?</p> <p>2 A. I'm assuming it would, yes.</p> <p>3 Q. So every time AmerisourceBergen</p> <p>4 had a suspicious order at the time of the</p> <p>5 issuance of this order to show cause and before,</p> <p>6 every single time, for every customer, it would</p> <p>7 have triggered a due diligence investigation?</p> <p>8 A. I don't know that. I don't know</p> <p>9 that for sure.</p> <p>10 Q. You don't know that?</p> <p>11 A. I don't know that.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you have any specific</p> <p>13 understanding of how AmerisourceBergen's due</p> <p>14 diligence process worked --</p> <p>15 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>16 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>17 Q. -- at that time and before?</p> <p>18 A. I've already answered that.</p> <p>19 Q. Well, I'm trying to understand</p> <p>20 what would trigger a due diligence investigation.</p> <p>21 You don't seem to know.</p> <p>22 MS. McCLURE: Objection,</p> <p>23 misstates the witness's testimony, asked</p> <p>24 and answered, form.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 87</p> <p>1 asked and answered.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: Yes. I already</p> <p>3 explained that to you.</p> <p>4 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>5 Q. Well, I'm asking you questions,</p> <p>6 and you're saying you don't know.</p> <p>7 A. Well, I don't know if it was done</p> <p>8 on every single order.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay.</p> <p>10 A. I couldn't tell you. It may have</p> <p>11 been.</p> <p>12 Q. But that's something that you</p> <p>13 don't seem to know about the system. Agree?</p> <p>14 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Ask the question</p> <p>16 again? I'm sorry.</p> <p>17 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>18 Q. Well, I'm trying to understand if</p> <p>19 AmerisourceBergen had an order that was</p> <p>20 suspicious, whether that order triggered a</p> <p>21 specific due diligence inspection of the order.</p> <p>22 A. If it -- if that -- if that order</p> <p>23 showed up on a suspicious order report, it would</p> <p>24 have triggered a due diligence investigation.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 89</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: As I recall, a due</p> <p>2 diligence investigation would have been</p> <p>3 prompted by customers showing up on that</p> <p>4 suspicious order report, that possible</p> <p>5 excessive and suspicious orders I think</p> <p>6 is what it's called. That would prompt</p> <p>7 that due diligence to be done.</p> <p>8 Would it be done every single</p> <p>9 time an order would hit that? I don't</p> <p>10 know. I don't recall.</p> <p>11 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>12 Q. Would you have investigated that</p> <p>13 order specifically, or would you just look at the</p> <p>14 customer?</p> <p>15 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: We mainly would</p> <p>17 look at the customer.</p> <p>18 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>19 Q. And what would the nature of your</p> <p>20 customer inquiry be?</p> <p>21 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: The nature would be</p> <p>23 a site visit and completion of a</p> <p>24 questionnaire.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p> <p>1 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>2 Q. So did this prompt any changes to</p> <p>3 AmerisourceBergen's suspicious order monitoring</p> <p>4 system?</p> <p>5 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: Did what prompt?</p> <p>7 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>8 Q. This order to show cause.</p> <p>9 A. Oh, yes, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. That resulted in a settlement</p> <p>11 agreement with DEA. Correct?</p> <p>12 MS. McCLURE: Objection, asked</p> <p>13 and answered.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>15 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>16 Q. What were the nature of the</p> <p>17 changes that you instituted after this?</p> <p>18 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>19 And objection, asked and answered.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: We enhanced our</p> <p>21 suspicious order monitoring program at</p> <p>22 the direction of DEA. They wanted us to</p> <p>23 develop a system that would stop and hold</p> <p>24 an order and determine whether it was</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p> <p>1 Do you see that?</p> <p>2 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>3 Q. You are talking about attending</p> <p>4 an HDMA conference. Agreed?</p> <p>5 A. Agree.</p> <p>6 Q. It says, "The HDMA DMC agenda."</p> <p>7 Do you see that?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>9 Q. What's the HDMA DMC?</p> <p>10 A. HDMA DMA is a distribution</p> <p>11 management conference. It's an annual conference</p> <p>12 that HDMA conducts.</p> <p>13 Q. The subject of this email is</p> <p>14 "'Big Four' DEA Strategy Discussion 2."</p> <p>15 Do you see that?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. So you're reaching out to, at</p> <p>18 this time, people from McKesson, Cardinal Health</p> <p>19 and HD Smith to have a big four DEA strategy</p> <p>20 discussion. Correct?</p> <p>21 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: It's what it says,</p> <p>23 yeah, yeah.</p> <p>24 BY MR. PIFKO:</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p> <p>1 suspicious before shipping it.</p> <p>2 - - -</p> <p>3 (Deposition Exhibit No. Mays</p> <p>4 V2-2, Email chain, top one dated 3 Mar</p> <p>5 2013, Bates stamped ABDCMDL00378483</p> <p>6 through ABDCMDL00378488, was marked for</p> <p>7 identification.)</p> <p>8 - - -</p> <p>9 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>10 Q. Handing you what's marked as Mays</p> <p>11 Volume 2, Exhibit 2.</p> <p>12 For the record, it's an email</p> <p>13 thread labeled ABDCMDL00378483 through 88.</p> <p>14 Let me know when you're done,</p> <p>15 take a moment to review that.</p> <p>16 A. (Reviewing document.)</p> <p>17 Okay.</p> <p>18 Q. Right. If you go to the second</p> <p>19 to last page here.</p> <p>20 A. Okay.</p> <p>21 Q. It's the start of -- well, it's</p> <p>22 an email -- that part of the header is on the</p> <p>23 prior page, but it's an email from you to people</p> <p>24 at Cardinal Health, McKesson and HD Smith.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p> <p>1 Q. Why were you reaching out to</p> <p>2 representatives from this company -- these</p> <p>3 companies to have a DEA strategy discussion at</p> <p>4 this time?</p> <p>5 A. I think we would typically get</p> <p>6 together sometime around those -- those</p> <p>7 conferences, because it was about the only time</p> <p>8 of the year we had face-to-face time. And we</p> <p>9 would just talk about common concerns and issues</p> <p>10 that we have and do some benchmarking, share</p> <p>11 ideas about how we can improve our programs.</p> <p>12 Q. When you say programs and</p> <p>13 concerns, you're talking about specifically in</p> <p>14 the diversion control area. Correct?</p> <p>15 A. No. It could be anything</p> <p>16 regulatory, not just diversion. It could be</p> <p>17 things about, you know, sometimes we would talk</p> <p>18 about DEA inspections and how they -- how they're</p> <p>19 handled, just to get some -- help each other out.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. But what I'm trying to ask</p> <p>21 is, when you were talking about concerns and</p> <p>22 benchmarking and programs, you're talking about</p> <p>23 programs that relate to DEA compliance. Correct?</p> <p>24 A. I think for the most part. It's</p>



Page 94

1 basically anything regulatory that we could talk  
2 about.  
3 Q. And these other people at  
4 McKesson, Cardinal Health and HD Smith, they all  
5 had similar responsibilities for regulatory and  
6 compliance issues like you did?  
7 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
8 THE WITNESS: For the most part  
9 as I recall, yes.  
10 BY MR. PIFKO:  
11 Q. So this was -- this specific  
12 subject line says, "Strategy Discussion 2."  
13 Do you see that?  
14 A. Yeah.  
15 Q. So this was -- and as you just  
16 testified, this was something that you regularly  
17 did in connection with HDMA meetings that  
18 occurred annually?  
19 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  
20 THE WITNESS: Not always. I  
21 think we'd met before. Might not have  
22 been at an HDA meeting.  
23 BY MR. PIFKO:  
24 Q. But you had, with some degree of

Page 95

1 regularity, meetings with these people to discuss  
2 regulatory and compliance issues?  
3 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  
4 THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say  
5 regularity. We only met like that maybe  
6 two or three times.  
7 BY MR. PIFKO:  
8 Q. When was the first time you had  
9 such a meeting like that?  
10 A. I can't remember if it was before  
11 this one or after this one. We met in Chicago at  
12 the airport one time. And I think Cardinal  
13 hosted that meeting.  
14 Q. Do you have a rough idea about  
15 when that was?  
16 MS. McCLURE: Objection.  
17 THE WITNESS: No, I don't.  
18 MS. McCLURE: Asked and answered.  
19 BY MR. PIFKO:  
20 Q. But it was a meeting in Chicago  
21 at the airport?  
22 A. I believe it was, yeah.  
23 Q. Was that in connection with an  
24 HDMA conference?

Page 96

1 A. No, I don't believe it was.  
2 Q. What was your recollection that  
3 brought you all to Chicago?  
4 A. I think it had been after, you  
5 know, the companies -- you know, we had had  
6 action taken against us and I think Cardinal and  
7 I'm not sure if McKesson had at the time. And I  
8 think the idea was just to get together and see  
9 how we could do things better.  
10 Q. You think that would have been in  
11 2007 or '8?  
12 MS. McCLURE: Objection.  
13 THE WITNESS: I don't think so.  
14 I think it might have been after that. I  
15 don't know.  
16 BY MR. PIFKO:  
17 Q. What action had been taken  
18 against you that you're recalling?  
19 A. The suspension that we were  
20 previously talking about.  
21 Q. And you recall that Cardinal had  
22 had some action taken against it around the time  
23 of this meeting as well?  
24 A. Yeah.

Page 97

1 Q. What specifically was the nature  
2 of your understanding about the action taken  
3 against Cardinal at that time?  
4 A. The one -- the meeting in  
5 Chicago? That was when -- because I remember the  
6 guy was at that meeting, Michael Mone from  
7 Cardinal. And he got called during the meeting,  
8 and he had to leave. And I think it was when  
9 they had their -- one of their registrations  
10 suspended or something and he had to leave. We  
11 didn't know what it was about, but he had to just  
12 leave all of a sudden.  
13 Q. Okay. Do you have a rough idea  
14 on or around the time that was?  
15 A. No, I don't.  
16 Q. Did that -- your recollection  
17 lead to a fine against Cardinal Health?  
18 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  
19 THE WITNESS: I think it did  
20 after that, but I'm not -- I don't --  
21 because it seems like they had a couple.  
22 And I'm not sure if both resulted in  
23 fines.  
24 BY MR. PIFKO:



<p style="text-align: right;">Page 98</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. And then you know you had  2 this meeting that's reflected in Exhibit 2.  3 Correct?  4 A. Uh-huh.  5 Q. And then you believe there was  6 another meeting that you recall. Correct?  7 A. The one at HDA, the one at HDMA  8 and then the one in Chicago. I think that was  9 all. There may have been another one.  10 Q. You think there was another one?  11 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  12 THE WITNESS: I may be thinking  13 about the same one, the one at the HDA  14 meeting, that -- it's the two that I can  15 recall specifically, yeah.  16 BY MR. PIFKO:  17 Q. This meeting reflected in  18 Exhibit 2, this was a meeting that was ultimately  19 held. Correct?  20 A. You know, I don't remember the  21 meeting itself, whether we actually had it or  22 not. I'm -- I don't want to assume, but --  23 Q. Where was this?  24 A. -- it looks like we planned to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 100</p> <p>1 2/6/2008, Bates stamped  2 CAH_MDL2804_01364805 through  3 CAH_MDL2804_01364809, was marked for  4 identification.)  5 - - -  6 BY MR. PIFKO:  7 Q. Handing you what's marked as Mays  8 Volume 2 Exhibit 3.  9 For the record, this is a  10 Cardinal Health document Bates labeled  11 CAH_MDL2804_01364805 to 809.  12 Take a moment to review this and  13 let me know when you're ready.  14 A. Okay.  15 (Reviewing document.)  16 Okay.  17 Q. Have you seen this before?  18 A. I don't recall it.  19 Q. You see at the top it's an email  20 from you to Steve Reardon?  21 A. Yes, I do.  22 Q. Dated February 6, 2008?  23 A. Yes, I see that.  24 Q. It's discussing a Bloomberg story</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 99</p> <p>1 get together, but I just don't remember the  2 meeting specifically.  3 Q. Where was this meeting?  4 A. I saw something in the email  5 about me having tickets to Phillies spring  6 training, so I believe that was when the  7 conference was in Tampa.  8 Q. Okay.  9 A. The HDA conference was in Tampa.  10 Q. And then you talk about in this  11 email about scheduling a dinner with them as  12 well?  13 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.  14 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I just don't  15 recall who went to dinner or not. I just  16 don't remember that.  17 BY MR. PIFKO:  18 Q. Do you think that you had other  19 meetings with these individuals in subsequent HDA  20 conferences?  21 A. I don't recall.  22 - - -  23 (Deposition Exhibit No. Mays  24 V2-3, Email chain, top one dated</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 101</p> <p>1 about McKesson negotiating shipping restrictions  2 as part of a DEA probe. Agree?  3 A. Yeah. Yes, I agree.  4 Q. You forwarded this article to  5 Steve Reardon at Cardinal Health. Agree?  6 A. That's what it looks like, yes.  7 Q. Who is Steve Reardon?  8 A. He was my counterpart at Cardinal  9 at the time.  10 Q. And you thought that he would be  11 interested to see this article about McKesson?  12 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  13 THE WITNESS: I would think so.  14 That would be the only reason I would  15 have sent it to him.  16 BY MR. PIFKO:  17 Q. You had a practice of exchanging  18 information with Mr. Reardon about diversion  19 control issues?  20 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.  21 THE WITNESS: No.  22 BY MR. PIFKO:  23 Q. Why do you believe you would have  24 shared this with him on this occasion?</p>

Page 102	Page 104
<p>1 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: I don't recall.</p> <p>3 This was 11 years ago. I don't remember</p> <p>4 why I sent it to him.</p> <p>5 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>6 Q. Did you have regular</p> <p>7 communications with Steve Reardon?</p> <p>8 MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Well, how -- define</p> <p>10 regular. Every day, every week, every</p> <p>11 month, every year?</p> <p>12 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>13 Q. With any degree of regularity.</p> <p>14 MS. McCLURE: Objection to the</p> <p>15 definition.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: What's regularity?</p> <p>17 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>18 Q. What's regular to you?</p> <p>19 A. Regular would be every day.</p> <p>20 Q. Did you talk to Steve Reardon</p> <p>21 with some frequency?</p> <p>22 MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: I would say</p> <p>24 occasionally, at HDA calls, HDA meetings,</p>	<p>1 record at 1:00 p.m.</p> <p>2 (Witness excused.)</p> <p>3 (Deposition concluded at</p> <p>4 approximately 1:00 p.m.)</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p>
Page 103	Page 105
<p>1 things like that. Not a lot of back and</p> <p>2 forth, no.</p> <p>3 BY MR. PIFKO:</p> <p>4 Q. From time to time you would share</p> <p>5 information, though, with him about issues in the</p> <p>6 drug distribution business. Correct?</p> <p>7 A. Yes. As long as it was not</p> <p>8 proprietary information from ABC.</p> <p>9 MR. PIFKO: Go off the record for</p> <p>10 a minute.</p> <p>11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the</p> <p>12 record, 12:56 p.m.</p> <p>13 - - -</p> <p>14 (A recess was taken from</p> <p>15 12:56 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.)</p> <p>16 - - -</p> <p>17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on record</p> <p>18 at 1:00 p.m.</p> <p>19 MR. PIFKO: All right. We don't</p> <p>20 have any further questions at this time.</p> <p>21 MS. McCLURE: No further -- no</p> <p>22 questions.</p> <p>23 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This ends</p> <p>24 today's deposition. We're going off the</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2 CERTIFICATE</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 I HEREBY CERTIFY that the witness</p> <p>6 was duly sworn by me and that the deposition is a</p> <p>7 true record of the testimony given by the</p> <p>8 witness.</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 It was requested before</p> <p>11 completion of the deposition that the witness,</p> <p>12 STEPHEN MAYS, have the opportunity to read and</p> <p>13 sign the deposition transcript.</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 ANN MARIE MITCHELL, a Federally</p> <p>16 Approved Certified Realtime</p> <p>17 Reporter, Registered Diplomate</p> <p>18 Reporter, Registered Merit Reporter and</p> <p>19 Notary Public</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 (The foregoing certification of</p> <p>22 this transcript does not apply to any</p> <p>23 reproduction of the same by any means, unless</p> <p>24 under the direct control and/or supervision of</p> <p>the certifying reporter.)</p>

Page 106

INSTRUCTIONS TO WITNESS

Please read your deposition over carefully and make any necessary corrections. You should state the reason in the appropriate space on the errata sheet for any corrections that are made.

After doing so, please sign the errata sheet and date it.

You are signing same subject to the changes you have noted on the errata sheet, which will be attached to your deposition.

It is imperative that you return the original errata sheet to the deposing attorney within thirty (30) days of receipt of the deposition transcript by you. If you fail to do so, the deposition transcript may be deemed to be accurate and may be used in court.

Page 107

- - - - -  
 E R R A T A  
 - - - - -

PAGE LINE CHANGE

REASON: \_\_\_\_\_

REASON: \_\_\_\_\_

REASON: \_\_\_\_\_

REASON: \_\_\_\_\_

REASON: \_\_\_\_\_

REASON: \_\_\_\_\_

REASON: \_\_\_\_\_

REASON: \_\_\_\_\_

REASON: \_\_\_\_\_

REASON: \_\_\_\_\_

REASON: \_\_\_\_\_

Page 108

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DEPONENT

I, \_\_\_\_\_, do hereby certify that I have read the foregoing pages, 1 - 108, and that the same is a correct transcription of the answers given by me to the questions therein propounded, except for the corrections or changes in form or substance, if any, noted in the attached Errata Sheet.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 STEPHEN MAYS                      DATE

Subscribed and sworn to before me this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_.

My commission expires: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Notary Public